



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/044,341	01/11/2002	Wayne A. Provost	14689.11	8023
22913	7590	03/06/2006		
WORKMAN NYDEGGER (F/K/A WORKMAN NYDEGGER & SEELEY) 60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE 1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111			EXAMINER TOMASZEWSKI, MICHAEL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3626	

DATE MAILED: 03/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/044,341

Applicant(s)

PROVOST ET AL.

Examiner

Mike Tomaszewski

Art Unit

3626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                                    |                                                                             |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)               | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                                |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>18 March 2002</u> .                                                       | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Notice To Applicant***

1. This communication is in response to the application filed on 11 January 2002. Claims 1-26 are pending. The IDS statement filed on 18 March 2002 has been entered and considered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 2, 5-17, and 19-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joao (6,283,761; hereinafter Joao) in view of Peterson et al. (6,343,271; hereinafter Peterson),

- (A) As per claim 1, Joao discloses in a server system that communicates with a client system associated with a health care provider and is adapted to facilitate

Art Unit: 3626

processing of an insurance claim, a method of delivering a supporting document to a carrier to enable the carrier to process an insurance claim, the method comprising the acts of:

- (1) receiving an insurance claim from the client system (Joao: abstract; col. 2, line 25-col. 3, line 45; col. 4, line 59-col. 5, line 7; fig. 1); and
- (2) notifying the carrier that an electronic image of the supporting document is available to enable the carrier to process the insurance claim (Joao: col. 4, lines 5-11; col. 5, lines 7-18; col. 6, lines 45-61; col. 34, lines 59-62; fig. 1).

Joao, however, fails to expressly disclose in a server system that communicates with a client system associated with a health care provider and is adapted to facilitate processing of an insurance claim, a method of delivering a supporting document to a carrier to enable the carrier to process an insurance claim, the method comprising the acts of:

- (3) receiving a supporting document associated with the insurance claim in an electronic format from the client system.

Nevertheless, these features are old and well known in the art, as evidenced by Peterson. In particular, Peterson discloses in a server system that communicates with a client system associated with a health care provider and is adapted to facilitate

Art Unit: 3626

processing of an insurance claim, a method of delivering a supporting document to a carrier to enable the carrier to process an insurance claim, the method comprising the acts of:

- (3) receiving a supporting document associated with the insurance claim in an electronic format from the client system (Peterson: abstract; col. 3, line 12-col. 4, line 20; fig. 1-11).

One of ordinary skill would have found it obvious at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Peterson with the teachings of Joao with the motivation of providing a means for facilitating claim processing (Peterson: col. 3, lines 54-63).

(B) As per claim 2, Joao discloses a method as recited in claim 1, further comprising the act of transmitting information to the client system that causes the client system to prompt a user of the client system to submit the supporting document associated with an insurance claim (Joao: col. 25, lines 15-19; col. 29, lines 28-40; col. 35, lines 11-col. 36, line 30; fig. 1).

(C) As per claim 5, Joao discloses a method as recited in claim 1, further comprising the acts of:

- (1) transmitting claim information associated with the insurance claim to

payment entity, wherein, upon receiving the claim information, the payment entity advances money to the client system prior to the carrier making payment on the insurance claim (Joao: col. 37, lines 48-65; fig. 1); and

- (2) transmitting the insurance claim to the carrier, wherein, upon receiving the insurance claim, the carrier makes payment on the insurance claim to the payment entity, thereby paying for the money advanced to the client system (Joao: col. 37, lines 48-65; fig. 1).

(D) As per claim 6, Joao discloses a method as recited in claim 1, wherein the act of notifying the carrier comprises the act of delivering a copy of the electronic image of the supporting document to the carrier (Joao: col. 3, lines 33-45; col. 4, lines 5-11; col. 5, lines 7-18; col. 6, lines 45-61; col. 34, lines 59-62; fig. 1).

(E) As per claim 7, Joao discloses a method as recited in claim 1, wherein the act of notifying the carrier comprises the act of delivering an access credential to the carrier, the access credential being patient specific (Joao: col. 4, lines 6-10; col. 7, lines 16-24; col. 39, lines 54-62).

(F) As per claim 8, Joao discloses a method as recited in claim 7, wherein the access credential is unique to the carrier (Joao: col. 4, lines 6-10; col. 7, lines 16-24; col. 39, lines 54-62).

(G) As per claim 9, Joao discloses a method as recited in claim 7, wherein the access credential is specific for the combination of the carrier, the insurance claim, and an institutional health care provider associated with the client system (Joao: col. 4, lines 6-10; col. 7, lines 16-24; col. 39, lines 54-62).

(H) As per claim 10, Joao discloses a method as recited in claim 1, further comprising the act of, upon receiving a request from the carrier, displaying the electronic image of the supporting document to the carrier (Joao: col. 4, lines 5-11; col. 5, lines 7-18; col. 6, lines 45-61; col. 34, lines 59-62; col. 31, line 65-col. 32, line 46; fig. 1).

(I) As per claim 11, Joao discloses a method as recited in claim 1, further comprising the act of transmitting a request for the supporting document to the client system, wherein the supporting document is received by the server system in response to the request (Joao: col. 4, lines 5-11; col. 5, lines 7-18; col. 6, lines 45-61; col. 34, lines 59-62; col. 31, line 65-col. 32, line 46; fig. 1).

(J) As per claim 12, Joao discloses a method as recited in claim 11, further comprising the act of selecting the supporting document based on information included in the insurance claim, wherein the act of requesting the supporting document is performed after and in response to the act of selecting the supporting document (Joao:

Art Unit: 3626

col. 4, lines 5-11; col. 5, lines 7-18; col. 6, lines 45-61; col. 34, lines 59-62; col. 31, line 65-col. 32, line 46; fig. 1).

(K) As per claim 13, Joao discloses a method as recited in claim 11, further comprising the act of notifying the client system that the insurance claim is eligible for advance payment, wherein the act of notifying is conducted prior to the act of transmitting the request for the supporting document (Joao: col. 4, lines 5-11; col. 5, lines 7-18; col. 6, lines 45-61; col. 34, lines 59-62; col. 31, line 65-col. 32, line 46; fig. 1).

(L) As per claim 14, Joao discloses in a client system that is associated with an institutional health care provider and communicates with a server system adapted to facilitate processing of an insurance claim, a method of providing a supporting document to the server system to enable a carrier associated with the insurance claim to process an insurance claim, the method comprising the acts of:

- (1) receiving, at the client system associated with the institutional health care provider, patient information, insurance information, and treatment information entered into a computer-displayable claim form displayed by the client system (Joao: abstract; col. 2, line 25-col. 4, line 5; col. 4, line 59-col. 5, line 7; col. 16, lines 38-65; fig. 1);
- (2) transmitting an insurance claim that includes the patient information, insurance information, and treatment information from the client system to

the remote server computer (Joao: abstract; col. 2, line 25-col. 4, line 5; col. 4, line 59-col. 5, line 7; fig. 1); and

- (3) transmitting the supporting document in an electronic format from the client system (Joao: col. 25, lines 15-19; col. 29, lines 28-40; col. 35, lines 11-col. 36, line 30; fig. 1).

Joao, however, fails to expressly disclose in a client system that is associated with an institutional health care provider and communicates with a server system adapted to facilitate processing of an insurance claim, a method of providing a supporting document to the server system to enable a carrier associated with the insurance claim to process an insurance claim, the method comprising the acts of:

- (4) identifying, by the client system, a supporting document that is required to process the insurance claim.

Nevertheless, this feature is old and well known in the art, as evidenced by Peterson. In particular, Peterson discloses disclose in a client system that is associated with an institutional health care provider and communicates with a server system adapted to facilitate processing of an insurance claim, a method of providing a supporting document to the server system to enable a carrier associated with the insurance claim to process an insurance claim, the method comprising the acts of:

- (4) identifying, by the client system, a supporting document that is required to process the insurance claim (Peterson: abstract; col. 3, line 12-col. 4, line 20; fig. 1-11).

One of ordinary skill would have found it obvious at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Peterson with the teachings of Joao with the motivation of providing a means for facilitating claim processing (Peterson: col. 3, lines 54-63).

(M) As per claim 15, Joao discloses a method as recited in claim 14, wherein the act of identifying comprises receiving a request for the supporting document from the server system (Joao: col. 4, lines 5-11; col. 5, lines 7-18; col. 6, lines 45-61; col. 34, lines 59-62; col. 31, line 65-col. 32, line 46; fig. 1).

(N) As per claim 16, Joao discloses a method as recited in claim 14, further comprising the act of displaying a prompt to a medical technician using the client system, the prompt specifying the support document to be delivered to server system (Joao: col. 25, lines 15-19; col. 29, lines 28-40; col. 35, lines 11-col. 36, line 30; fig. 1).

(O) As per claim 17, Joao discloses a method as recited in claim 14, further comprising the act of receiving data from a scanner associated with the client system, wherein the data from the scanner represents the supporting document in the electronic format and is received in response to a paper copy of the document being scanned by

Art Unit: 3626

the scanner (Joao: col. 16, lines 3-18; col. 25, lines 15-19; col. 29, lines 28-40; col. 35, lines 11-col. 36, line 30; fig. 1).

(P) As per claim 19, Joao discloses a method as recited in claim 14, wherein the act of transmitting the supporting document is conducted such that the carrier can process the insurance claim without any supporting documents being sent by mail (Joao: abstract; col. 3, line 33-col.4, line 25; col. 6, lines 45-52; fig. 1).

(Q) As per claim 20, Joao discloses a method as recited in claim 19, wherein the act of transmitting the supporting document is conducted such that the server system is capable of making an electronic image of the supporting document available to the carrier (Joao: abstract; col. 3, line 33-col.4, line 25; col. 6, lines 45-52; fig. 1).

(R) Claims 21-22 substantially repeat the same limitations of claims 1-20 and are therefore, rejected for the same reasons given for those claims.

(S) As per claim 23, Joao fails to expressly disclose a method as recited in claim 22, wherein the credential comprises a username and a password.

Nevertheless, this feature is old and well known in the art, as evidenced by Peterson. In particular, Peterson discloses a method as recited in claim 22, wherein the credential comprises a username and a password (Peterson: col. 8, lines 39-43; col. 14, lines 25-31).

Art Unit: 3626

One of ordinary skill would have found it obvious at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Peterson with the teachings of Joao with the motivation of providing a means for facilitating claim processing (Peterson: col. 3, lines 54-63).

(T) Claims 24-25 substantially repeat the same limitations of claims 1-20 and are therefore, rejected for the same reasons given for those claims.

(U) As per claim 26, Joao discloses a method as recited in claim 25, wherein the act of requesting the electronic image comprises communicating via the Internet with a computer associated with the server system that stores the electronic image (Joao: col. 3, line 33-col. 4, line 27).

4. Claims 3 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joao and Peterson as applied to claims 1 and 14 above, and further in view of Robinson-Crowley, Christine ("Understanding Patient Financial Services" Copyright 1998. Aspen Publishers; hereinafter Robinson).

(A) As per claim 3, Joao discloses a method as recited in claim 1, further comprising the act of determining whether the insurance claim is eligible for payment (Joao: col. 5, line 60-col. 6, line 5).

Joao, however, fails to expressly disclose a method as recited in claim 1, further comprising an *advance* payment [emphasis added].

Nevertheless, this feature is old and well known in the art, as evidenced by Robinson. In particular, Robinson discloses a method as recited in claim 1, further comprising an advance payment (Robinson: pg. 144; Examiner considers prepayment to read on "advance payment.").

One of ordinary skill would have found it obvious at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Robinson with the combined teachings of Joao and Peterson with the motivation of facilitating insurance claim processing (Joao: col. 2, lines 45-55).

(B) As per claim 18, Joao discloses a method as recited in claim 14, further comprising the act of receiving notification from the server system that the insurance claim is eligible for payment (Joao: col. 5, lines 7-18; col. 5, line 60-col. 6, line 5; fig. 1).

Joao, however, fails to expressly disclose a method as recited in claim 14, further comprising an *advance* payment [emphasis added].

Nevertheless, this feature is old and well known in the art, as evidenced by Robinson. In particular, Robinson discloses a method as recited in claim 14, further comprising an advance payment (Robinson: pg. 144; Examiner considers prepayment to read on "advance payment.").

One of ordinary skill would have found it obvious at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Robinson with the teachings of Joao with the motivation of facilitating insurance claim processing (Joao: col. 2, lines 45-55).

5. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joao, Peterson and Robinson as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Doyle, Jr. et al. (5,070,452; hereinafter Doyle).

(A) As per claim 4, Joao fails to expressly disclose a method as recited in claim 3, wherein the act of determining whether the insurance claim is eligible for advance payment comprises:

- (1) determining whether the treatment information corresponds to health care services that are approved for payment; and
- (2) determining whether the patient is an approved beneficiary of the carrier.

Nevertheless, these features are old and well known in the art, as evidenced by Doyle. In particular, Doyle discloses a method as recited in claim 3, wherein the act of determining whether the insurance claim is eligible for advance payment comprises:

- (1) determining whether the treatment information corresponds to health care services that are approved for payment (Doyle: abstract; col. 3, lines 5-10; fig. 1); and

- (2) determining whether the patient is an approved beneficiary of the carrier  
(Doyle: abstract; col. 3, lines 5-10; fig. 1).

One of ordinary skill would have found it obvious at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Doyle with the combined teachings of Joao, Peterson and Robinson with the motivation of providing an improved system for the administration of medical insurance claims (Doyle: col. 1, lines 65-67).

### ***Conclusion***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. The cited but not applied art teaches a system and method for managing insurance claim processing (5,950,169); loans and lines of credit provided to terminally ill individuals (US 2001/0047325); a method and apparatus for processing insurance applications over a network (US 2003/0083906); and automated posting of medical insurance claims (5,235,702).

The cited but not applied prior art also includes non-patent literature articles by Mueller, Christopher ("Evidence: Practice Under the Rules" Copyright 1999. Aspen Publishers. 2nd Edition.); Business Editors ("MedCom USA Inc. Names New CEO" Aug 9, 2001. Business Wire. pg. 1.); PR Newswire ("AnciCare Builds State-of-the-Art Billing Efficiency With New eStellarNet Payer Connectivity Agreement" Apr 27, 2001. pg. 1.);

Art Unit: 3626

Business Editors ("VantageMed and eStellarNet Announce Strategic Relationship for Electronic Processing of Non-Group Health Transactions" Dec 19, 2000. Business Wire. pg. 1.); Business Editors ("MD-Online.com Appears On Alexander Haig's World Business Review TV Series. Oct 24, 2000. Business Wire. pg. 1.); PR Newswire ("Claimsnet.com Enters Into Co-branding Partnership With Synertech®" Sep 18, 2000. pg. 1.); Business Editors ("DrFirst.com Launches Secure Message Exchange Network Health Care Providers; DrFirst.com solves major problem in health care industry - securely connecting its participants" Aug 22, 2000. pg. 1.); and PR Newswire ("Physiciansite.com Announces Stock & Cash Transaction Valued At Approximately \$43 Million" Aug 24, 1999. pg. 1.).

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mike Tomaszewski whose telephone number is (571)272-8117. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00 am - 3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on (571)272-6776. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3626

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MT



2.8.06



C. LUKE GILLIGAN  
PATENT EXAMINER